## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21are in this application.

Claims 1, 16, 20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Pitschi (US 5,518,420), the Examiner noting, "a dielectric member (5) disposed between the first end portion of the cylindrical outer portion of the connector and the outer conductor of the coaxial transmission line (direct contact between 3 and 7 is prevented by 5)." Applicant respectfully submits that ring seal 5 of Pitschi does not anticipate the structure of claim 1, namely of being "disposed between...(2)...the cylindrical outer conductor of the connector and the outer conductor of the coaxial transmission line, so as to prevent a direct electrical contact therebetween" for the following reasons.

A main part of the outer conductor of the connector in Pitschi is connector housing 3. In the apparatus of Pitschi, electrical contact from the outer element of the connector to outer cable conductor 13 appears to be achieved mainly through corrugated nut 7 and support ring 4, as described in column 8, lines 49-53, describing points of electrical contact A and B on nut 7 and ring 4, respectively. As can be seen in Fig. 2A, the front edge of the ring seal 5a is not intended to and does not prevent this electrical contact.

Since care is taken to establish electrical contact between support ring 4 and outer cable conductor 13 at point B, ring 4 is obviously a conductor, consistent with the cross-hatching shown in the drawings. From all appearances, ring 4 is a principal electrical path from outer cable conductor 13 to the connector housing 3.

For the same reasons, it is submitted that Pitschi does not anticipate the structure of claim 16, namely, "disposed between...(2) the outer connector body and the outer conductor, so as to prevent a direct electrical contact therebetween."

With regard to claim 20, as the Examiner probably understands, the term "series open circuit outer stub" refers to the fact that the outer conductor of the connector does not make electrical contact with the outer conductor of the coaxial cable; the circuit between these parts is "open". Likewise, "a series open circuit inner stub" refers to the fact that the inner conductor of the connector does not make electrical contact with the center conductor of the coaxial cable. In this context, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that Pitschi's inner thread 6a (of bore 6 of the connector housing 3) is "a series open circuit outer stub". As explained above, Pitschi describes electrical contact and conduction from the outer cable conductor 13 through at least ring 4 to connector housing 3. Applicant has found no discussion within Pitschi of anything other than making connection between the connector and the cable by direct contact between electrical conductors. It is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is not anticipated by Pitschi.

For the reasons given, it is submitted that claims 1, 16 and 20 are not anticipated by Pitschi.

Claim 1 has have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Pitschi. The Examiner has stated (page 4 of the Office Action) that to make Pitschi's support ring 4 dielectric is within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In Pitschi's device, this substitution would destroy what appears to be the main outer conduction path, and so appears to be something that definitely would not be done. At the same time, it is doubted that the substitution would achieve the operational result of Applicant's invention. Moreover, it is submitted that there is nothing within Pitschi to remotely suggest the desirability of Applicant's structure, described in claim 1 (and claims 16 and 20), or the result provided by the structure, or any change in Pitschi's device that would achieve them. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 (and claims 16 and 20) is not obvious in view of Pitschi and is patentable in view thereof.

Some claims have been rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Pitschi as modified by Gattaz (US 4,022,518). Applicant will respond as though these claims are 1-5, 8, 9, 16, 17, and 20. The Examiner has stated that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill ...to utilize capacitive transmission by using dielectric material, as taught by Gattaz, to improve filtering characteristics of the Pitschi connector. Since there is no discussion of improving filtering characteristics in either of the references, it is respectfully submitted that this assertion is not founded. In addition, Applicant believes his claims are patentable in view of these references for the following reasons.

As described in the present application, for example, in paragraphs [02], [03], and [42], Applicant conceived of an improved way to connect a coaxial connector to a coaxial transmission line in certain applications, to avoid such problems as costly materials, excessive force on the cable conductors, the requirement for thicker conductors to withstand such force, specific installation requirements such as torque levels, and difficult installation in adverse weather conditions.

The resulting invention allows for simplified connector installation, including less precise cutting of the coaxial transmission cable, less critical torque requirements, and hand tightening. Further, the claimed connector eliminates passive intermodulation from the most likely source, while eliminating the most expensive and complicated parts of the connector.

Gattaz does teach capacitive coupling, but does not teach anything of a structure that would achieve the results just described. It makes no mention of using cable conductors as an integral part of the capacitive coupling to attach connectors to cable. The teachings of Gattaz about 3/4 wavelength dimensions that are applicable to its 16 GHz operation would not be practical in the frequency range for which Applicant's invention was conceived. Indeed, there is nothing in either of the references to suggest that Pitschi be modified in some way to achieve Applicant's claimed invention or what that modification might be.

Regarding claims 8 and 9, it is agreed that Pitschi shows a resilient ring seal 5. The structure required, for example in claim 8, is "a resilient gland disposed at a distal end of the dielectric member". It has been determined in connection with Fig. 2A that support ring 4 of Pitschi is not a dielectric member. There is no way of knowing how the placement of parts in Pitschi would be modified, even in hindsight, in accordance with Gattaz, so it seems that the claim structure just quoted cannot be obvious by the combination of references.

Accordingly, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 16 and 20, and the claims dependent thereon, including claims 2-5, 8, 9, and 17, are unobvious in respect to Pitschi as modified by Gattaz and are patentable in view of these references.

Claims 7 and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Pitschi in view of Gattaz and further in view of Behning (US 4,773,871). The nut of Behning is not shown as being used for coupling a transmission line to a connector. Moreover, it is believed that the nut 7 of Pitschi would not be made dielectric, because it would destroy an important conducting path. Gattaz appears not to have a coupling nut. So in Applicant's view, there are no teachings in the references on which to base an obviousness rejection. It is submitted that claims 7 and 17 are patentable over the cited references for these reasons and also as being dependent on claims 1 and 17, believed to be patentable.

Claims 12-14 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Pitschi in view of Gattaz and further in view of Forney, Jr. (US 3,663,901) as regards the "shunt short circuit stub" element of the present claims. Applicant does not see any teaching in respect to Fig. 3 of Forney or elsewhere in that reference that would suggest the shunt short circuit stub aspect of the structure described in connection with Applicant's Fig. 5 and claimed in claims 12-14 with detail as to its placement. It is submitted that claims 12-14 are patentable over this combination of references, as well as being dependent on patentable claim 1.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Pitschi in view of Ziemek et al. Ziemek shows a high frequency cable, but does not provide teaching that could lead from the connector of Pitschi to Applicant's connector which exhibits advantageous operation in the operating range of 800-6000MHz. Claim 15 is submitted to be patentable over this combination of references as well as being dependent on patentable claim 1.

The Examiner has indicated that dependent claims 6, 10, 11, 18, 19 and 21 are directed to allowable subject matter.

Since it is believed to have been shown that all of claims in this application are allowable, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of same. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,
ALCATEL

Dated: 1/21/2005

V. Lawrence Sewell
Reg. No. 22,753

Alcatel
Intellectual Property Department
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2
Plano, TX 75075
Phone: (972) 519-3735
Fax: (972) 477-9328